



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,082	12/28/2000	Anthony N. Sarra	10559/316001/P9677	3510

7590

08/27/2003

U.P. PETER ENG  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH AND ROSATI  
650 PAGE MILL ROAD  
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER

LE, DIEU MINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2184

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/753,082

Applicant(s)

SARRA ET AL.

Examiner

Dieu-Minh Le

Art Unit

2184

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2184

**Part III DETAILED ACTION**

**Specification**

1. Claims 1-30 are presented for examination.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Ananthanpillai (US Patent 5,333,308).

**As per claim 1:**

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
  - detecting a failure in a request for a file made by a program running on a device [col. 5, lines 19-23, col. 6, lines 21-42, and col. 8, lines 22-27];
  - initiating a repair mechanism that is configured to repair the failure [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 45-60].

This is clearly shown that Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement does illustrate, demonstrate, and teach capabilities corresponded to Applicant's invention.

As per claims 2-3:

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
- monitoring for a failure in a request for a file made by the program running on the device [fig. 2, col. 6, lines 1-20];
- automatically performing the monitoring throughout the running of the program on the device [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 40-54 and co. 4, lines 29-32].

This is clearly shown that Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement does illustrate, demonstrate, and teach capabilities corresponded to Applicant's invention.

As per claims 14-16:

These claims are the same as per claims 1-3. The only minor different is that these claims are directed to a **machine-**

Art Unit: 2184

**readable medium** instead of the method for detecting and repairing a failure as described in claims 1-13. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realized that a **machine-readable medium** is a necessary item for such communication devices including remote device or client-server networking system, more specifically, data communication or transmission between client-server system. Since the data transmission or client-server obviously needs a means for instruction or code means resided within the machine-readable medium for performing the data storing, receiving, detecting, tracking, monitoring, repairing, restarting, and transmitting operation capabilities. Therefore, these claims are also rejected under the same rationale applied against claims 1-3.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter

Art Unit: 2184

sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 4-13, 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ananthanpillai (US Patent 5,333,308) in view of Calvert et al. (US Patent 5,349,674 hereafter referred to as Calvert).

Art Unit: 2184

As per claim 4:

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
- detecting a failure in a request for a file made by a program running on a device [col. 5, lines 19-23, col. 6, lines 21-42, and col. 8, lines 22-27];
- initiating a repair mechanism that is configured to repair the failure [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 45-60].

Ananthanpillai does not explicitly teach:

- detecting from a location remote from the device.

However, Ananthanpillai does disclose capability of:

- method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement [abstract, col. 1, lines 40-63] comprising:
  - a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network [fig. 1-2, col. 2, lines 11-67];
  - first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a network environment (i.e., remotely

*monitoring, detecting, and communicating*) [fig. 1, col. 2  
lines 22-53];

In addition, Calvert explicitly teaches:

- an automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system [abstract, col. 1, lines 7-110;

comprising:

- error detection from remote location [fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 1-62];
- error detection, prevention, and correction [fig. 8A-B and 15, col. 18, lines 34-61];
- error fixing, solution logging and updating [fig. 18, col. 20, lines 33-56].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made first, to realize the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement via a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network, and more specifically via **first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a**



Art Unit: 2184

**network environment (i.e., remotely monitoring, detecting, and communicating)** as being detecting from a location remote from the device as claimed by Applicant. Since the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement does deal with the computer program error detection and correction, more specifically computer application program failure detection and repairing via a networking environment (i.e., remotely failure detection). Ananthanpillai clearly demonstrated the capability of application failure or error detection, monitoring, and repairing from remotely as well as locally networking arena in supporting the computer system operation; second, one would modify the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement to explicitly including the **error detection from remote location as well as error prevention, and correction capabilities** as taught by Calverts' automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system in supporting the computer program's error detection, repairing, and correction methodology.

This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide the computer application program error detection and correction via a remotely networking with a mechanism to

Art Unit: 2184

enhance the computer program and application performance and processing in ordering to provide a continuity computer processing networking system functionality. It is further obvious because by utilizing this approach, the computer application program with error detection and correction capabilities can be realized in:

- first, any error, or failure occurred can be identified, detected, repaired, corrected via data processing monitoring, data transmission control, and correct data execution;

- second, the computer application program can operate with a high reliability and flexibility environment which will correctly provide optimum data availability and transmission throughput.

As per claims 5-8:

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
- repairing the failure with the repair mechanism [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 45-60].
- restarting the program after the repair mechanism repair the failure [col. 4, lines 41-46 and col. 7, lines 2-14];
- user of the device can determine and initiate the repair mechanism [col. 5, lines 60-67].

In addition, Calvert explicitly teaches:

- an automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system [abstract, col. 1, lines 7-110;

comprising:

- error detection from remote location [fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 1-62];
- error detection, prevention, and correction [fig. 8A-B and 15, col. 18, lines 34-61];
- **user response, determination, perceived problems (i.e., user of the device can determine and initiate the repair mechanism) [fig. 10A, col. 13, lines 43-63].**

As per claims 9 and 12-13:

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
- detecting a failure in a request for a file made by a program running on a device [col. 5, lines 19-23, col. 6, lines 21-42, and col. 8, lines 22-27];
- initiating a repair mechanism that is configured to repair the failure [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 45-60].

Ananthanpillai does not explicitly teach:

- searching and transmitting a collection of data including repair mechanism.

However, Ananthanpillai does disclose capability of:

- method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement [abstract, col. 1, lines 40-63] comprising:

- a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network [fig. 1-2, col. 2, lines 11-67];

- a readily table for the user to add or modify entries in supporting the failure repair [col. 4, lines 32 through col. 5, lines 29];

- repair program can send system status message to user in supporting the failure detection and repair [col. 9, lines 18-33].

In addition, Calvert explicitly teaches:

- an automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system [abstract, col. 1, lines 7-110;

Art Unit: 2184

comprising:

- error detection from remote location [fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 1-62];
- error detection, prevention, and correction [fig. 8A-B and 15, col. 18, lines 34-61];
- **error fixing, solution logging and updating [fig. 18, col. 20, lines 32-56].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made first, to realize the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement via a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network, and more specifically **a readily table for the user to add or modify entries in supporting the failure repair as well as repair program can send system status message to user in supporting the failure detection and repair as being searching and transmitting a collection of data including repair mechanism as claimed by Applicant.** Since the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement does deal with the computer program error detection and correction, more specifically computer application

Art Unit: 2184

program failure detection and repairing mechanism defined in table 203 as depicted in figure 2. Ananthanpillai clearly demonstrated the capability of application failure or error detection, monitoring, and repairing from defined in table 203 as depicted in figure 2 in supporting the computer system operation; second, one would modify the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement to explicitly including the **error fixing, solution logging and updating capability** as taught by Calverts' automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system in supporting the computer program's error detection, repairing, and correction methodology for the same reasons set forth as described in claim 4, **supra**.

As per claims 10-11:

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a method comprising:
- notifying whether the repair mechanism successfully repaired the failure [col. 5, lines 24-29, col. 7, lines 33-38, and col. 8, lines 55-67].
- recording the detected failure [col. 4, lines 47-67];
- user of the device can determine and initiate the repair mechanism [col. 5, lines 60-67].

Ananthanpillai does not explicitly teach:

- a location remotely from device and collection of data.

However, Ananthanpillai does disclose capability of:

- method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement [abstract, col. 1, lines 40-63] comprising:

- first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a network environment (i.e., remotely monitoring, detecting, and communicating) [fig. 1, col. 2 lines 22-53];

- a readily table for the user to add or modify entries in supporting the failure repair [col. 4, lines 32 through col. 5, lines 29];

- repair program can send system status message to user in supporting the failure detection and repair [col. 9, lines 18-33].

In addition, Calvert explicitly teaches:

- an automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system [abstract, col. 1, lines 7-110];

Art Unit: 2184

comprising:

- error detection from remote location [fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 1-62];
- error detection, prevention, and correction [fig. 8A-B and 15, col. 18, lines 34-61];
- error fixing, solution logging and updating [fig. 18, col. 20, lines 32-56].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize the combination of Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement via a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network, and more specifically **first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a network environment (i.e., remotely monitoring, detecting, and communicating)**, a readily table for the user to add or modify entries in supporting the failure repair as well as repair program can send system status message to user in supporting the **failure detection and repair** and Calverts' automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system including **error fixing, solution logging and updating capability**



Art Unit: 2184

**do teach the** computer program's error detection, repairing, and correction methodology for the same reasons set forth as described in claim 4, **supra**.

As per claims 17-22:

These claims are the same as per claims 4-13. The only minor different is that these claims are directed to a **machine-readable medium** instead of the method for detecting and repairing a failure as described in claims 4-13. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realized that a **machine-readable medium** is a necessary item for such communication devices including remote device or client-server networking system, more specifically, data communication or transmission between client-server system. Since the data transmission or client-server obviously needs a means for instruction or code means resided within the machine-readable medium for performing the data storing, receiving, detecting, tracking, monitoring, repairing, restarting, and transmitting operation capabilities. Therefore, these claims are also rejected under the same rationale applied against claims 4-13.

As per claims 23-25:

Art Unit: 2184

Ananthanpillai explicitly teaches:

- a system comprising:
- detecting a failure in a request for a file made by a program running on a device [col. 5, lines 19-23, col. 6, lines 21-42, and col. 8, lines 22-27];
- initiating a repair mechanism that is configured to repair the failure [fig. 2-3, col. 1, lines 45-60].

Ananthanpillai does not explicitly teach:

- first, second, and third device configured to run, configured, and track failure.

However, Ananthanpillai does disclose capability of:

- method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement [abstract, col. 1, lines 40-63] comprising:
  - a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network [fig. 1-2, col. 2, lines 11-67];
  - first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a network environment (i.e., remotely monitoring, detecting, and communicating) [fig. 1, col. 2

Art Unit: 2184

lines 22-53] used to detecting, monitoring, and executing failures [col. 1, lines 40-63].

In addition, Calvert explicitly teaches:

- an automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system [abstract, col. 1, lines 7-10];

comprising:

- error detection from remote location [fig. 8A, col. 13, lines 1-62];
- error detection, prevention, and correction [fig. 8A-B and 15, col. 18, lines 34-61];
- error fixing, solution logging and updating [fig. 18, col. 20, lines 33-56].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made first, to realize the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement via a connectivity among communication nodes (i.e., devices), user end-workstations, network monitor, processor via a public or private switching network, and more specifically via **first node, second node, third node (i.e., devices) communicated via a**

Art Unit: 2184

network environment (*i.e., remotely monitoring, detecting, and communicating*) [fig. 1, col. 2 lines 22-53] used to detecting, monitoring, and executing failures [col. 1, lines 40-63] as being first, second, and third device configured to run, configured, and track failure as claimed by Applicant. Since the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement does deal with the computer program error detection and correction, more specifically computer application program failure detection and repairing via a multiple nodes or devices communicated over a networking environment. Ananthanpillai clearly demonstrated the capability of application failure or error detection, monitoring, and repairing from first, second, and third nodes or locations in ordering to provide a data transmission free of errors; second, one would modify the Ananthanpillai's method and apparatus for operating a communication network monitor arrangement to explicitly including the **error detection from remote location as well as error prevention, and correction capabilities** as taught by Calverts' automated enrollment of a computer system into a service network of computer system in supporting the computer program's error detection, repairing, and correction methodology.

Art Unit: 2184

This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to provide the computer application program error detection and correction via a remotely networking with a mechanism to enhance the computer program and application performance and processing in ordering to provide a continuity computer processing networking system functionality.

As per claims 26-30:

Due to the similarity of claims 26-30 to claims 4-13 except for a system for detecting and repairing a failure capabilities (i.e., detecting a failure, repairing a failure, etc...) instead of a method for detecting and repairing a failure steps (i.e., detecting a failure step, repairing a failure step, etc...); therefore, these claims are also rejected under the same rationale applied against claims 4-13. **In addition, all of the limitations have been noted in the rejection as per claims 4-13.**

Art Unit: 2184

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expired THREE (3) months, ZERO days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to be abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dieu-Minh Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-9408. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel, can be reached on (703)305-9713. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications  
intended for entry)

**Or:**

Art Unit: 2184

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



**DIEU-MINH THAI LE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2184**

DML  
8/20/03